

... THE ...

# Converted Catholic

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."--Luke xii: 32.

Vol. XIII.

MARCH, 1896.

No. 3

## EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS.

UP to the time of going to press with this issue of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, no further intelligence has come from the young monk whose letter is published on page 77. We are anxiously waiting for a response to our invitation to come to Christ's Mission, where he will be protected from the fury of his Superior, who "at times, when intoxicated," allows a relaxation of discipline so far as to permit the unfortunate convent prisoners to send out a letter without being read by him. If the wardens of our State prisons should indulge in strong drink, like this head monk, the prisoners could make plans for their escape like our correspondent. Those monasteries and convents must be open for inspection, and the inmates, who have committed no crime, but rather who have been deceived into believing that they serve God in the most holy manner by entering them, must be permitted to leave when they desire to do so. It is monstrous that such institutions, where the life of an inmate who wishes to depart is in danger, should be tolerated in our great Republic. We commend the subject to the serious consideration of all thinking persons in our Christian land.

When the Saviour addressed His disciples at the last supper, He said: "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." We do not say that the head monk and his lieutenants who share his potations would kill our correspondent if they captured him while attempting to escape, but they would beat him with rods and fists, as their rule enjoins, and trump up charges against him that would blacken his character. The spirit of Rome, when thwarted, is as satanic as was that of the synagogue or corrupt church of the Pharisees when our Lord told His disciples that the members of the synagogue would think they were doing God service by killing them. The motto of the Jesuits is, *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam* "For the greater glory of God,"—and the true Jesuit will wade in blood if necessary to promote that "greater glory" from his point of view. Generally speaking, murder is accounted a sin and crime by the Jesuits, unless it be committed "for the greater glory of God." Then it can be justified or set down as venial, and absolution can be easily obtained from a Jesuit confessor.

**Monastery and Purgatory.**

The poor monk who wants to escape says in his letter that he hopes to leave immediately after officiating at "requiem high mass." That mass is for the soul of some person who is in purgatory and naturally desires to escape from such a place. Here is a mixed state of affairs. The officiating minister at the mass is offering prayers for the deliverance of a soul in purgatory while he himself is most fervently offering inaudible prayers and writing letters to the editor of this magazine that he might find a way of escape from the monastery, which is a much more real place of detention and punishment than the mythical purgatory. If the soul in purgatory could pray in a charitable spirit, it would say, "Let the poor monk escape first, and then my turn may come."

While this is a serious matter for the convent prisoner, who may be now suffering the penance and punishment in the convent Inquisition which he feared his attempt to escape would bring on him, our Catholic readers will not fail to perceive the grim humor of the situation. While the Superior of the monastery is indulging in a debauch, one of his bright young monks seizes the opportunity to write us a letter beseeching us to aid him in running away, and he is perfecting his plans while officiating at a high mass for a soul in purgatory, which is supposed to be in suffering, "like unto that of hell," as theologians say.

The Roman Catholic Church has suppressed the truth of the Gospel which says that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." Purgatory is possible only, even in thought, where it is practically denied that the blood of Christ does cleanse from all sin. The Roman Catholic doctrine is a delusion and a snare, from which we pray the good Lord to deliver the Roman Catholic people.

**The Holy Scriptures.**

Whence but from heav'n could men  
unskill'd in arts,  
In several ages born, in several parts,  
Weave such agreeing truths? or how  
or why  
Should all conspire to cheat us with a  
lie?  
Unask'd their pains, ungrateful their  
advice,  
Starving their gain, and martyrdom  
their price.  
Then for the style: majestic and divine,  
It speaks no less than God in every  
line:  
Commanding words, whose force is still  
the same  
As the first fiat produced our frame.  
All faiths beside, or did by arms ascend,  
Or sense indulged has made mankind  
their friend:  
This only doctrine does our lusts oppose;  
Unfed by nature's soil on which it grows,  
Cross to our interests, curbing sense and  
sin,  
Oppress'd without, undermined within,  
It thrives through pain, its own  
tormentors tires,  
And with a stubborn patience still  
aspires.  
To what can reason such effects assign,  
Transcending nature, but to laws divine,  
Which in that sacred volume are  
contain'd,  
Sufficient, clear, and for that use ordain'd?  
—Dryden.

**Kind Words.**

From the *Chicago Free Methodist*,  
January 29, 1896:

If you want reliable articles, facts and figures on the subject of Roman Catholicism, read *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, edited and published by Rev. James A. O'Connor, 142 West Twenty-first street, New York. The first number for 1896 is rich in matter which bears on the subject of evangelical work among Catholics. Many priests come to Christ's Mission in New York (Father O'Connor's mission) and are converted. But the work is then only just begun. Dr. John Hall has well said: "An educated man without means and without any training—save for the position he has abandoned—is in a pitiable condition, and it would be wise and kind to encourage him to utilize the knowledge he has gained, and to add to it." Dr. O'Connor needs help and co-operation in his work. The best knowledge of this enterprise is obtained by reading *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*.

## BIBLE REASONS WHY WE ARE PROTESTANTS.

A SERMON DELIVERED AT THE REFORMED CATHOLIC SERVICES IN MASONIC TEMPLE, NEW YORK, SUNDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 23, 1896,

BY REV. DR. JOHN HALL, PASTOR OF THE FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

MY text is from the 1st epistle of Peter in the 3d chapter 15th verse. "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear."

My dear friends, I propose to speak in plain language which every one of you can understand so that you may carry away with you an idea and suggestion for maturer meditation, and I trust the Spirit of God will help and bless the things spoken to everyone present this evening.

The Epistle of Peter from which my text is taken, begins in that modest and loving way which characterizes the apostle—"Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ." He is

writing to strangers of the various countries, reminding them of the great glorious inheritance to which they were elected through the sanctification of the Spirit, exhorting them to holiness and abstinence from all lusts, having their conversation honest among the Gentiles. It is a letter full of tenderness and affection. It is, however, singular to notice, by the way, that there is not one allusion to Rome in it. Indeed, the word Rome occurs only nine times in the Bible, and never is Peter connected with it.

A part of the third chapter is written to wives, instructing them in a kind and gracious manner as to their duties and as to the way they should carry themselves. Six verses are devoted to the subject, and he places the wives before the husbands. One single verse is addressed to the husbands, reminding them of their duties. Peter was a married man. We know it from the Gospel tel-

ling us that Christ healed his wife's mother. We can understand, therefore, the sympathy of Peter for home life. The rest of the chapter contains general admonitions to those Christians to whom he is writing, and who were suffering many trials and persecutions because of Christianity, giving them directions as to how they should



REV. JOHN HALL, D.D., LL.D.

carry themselves in trying circumstances of life, admonishing them to suffer for righteousness' sake, but to sanctify the Lord God in their hearts. He uses the solemn words, sanctify the Lord "in your hearts." There is no allusion to ceremonies and rites, but the heart is pointed out as the seat of true religion, and God there enthroned as Supreme Governor and Ruler. No concealment of these truths from those who persecuted them is advised, but a frank, intelligent adhesion to their religion. "Be ready to give an

answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you." He counsels them to know what they believe and be able to answer for their belief to their inquiring fellow men, not in a haughty spirit, not in a controversial spirit; no, indeed, but in meekness and fear—not in the sense of fear of man, but in the sense of reverence of God's truth—and also in meekness with that spirit of tender mercy which best imitates the Divine Saviour. If I know my own heart I wish to speak in this sense to you.

Why do we bear the name of Protestants? It does not and it should not imply any hostility against those who are outside the pale of our own convictions. In my native land (Ireland) two thirds of the population are under the sway of the Church of Rome. For three years I labored among them to make known the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, and I had ample opportunity for many years to come in contact with them. While I was on duty on the National Board of Education, I became acquainted with several educated men of whom I could speak as my personal friends. I had also the privilege and opportunity to see the Pope of Rome—not the present Pope, but his predecessor—engaged in washing the feet of twelve poor men; and therefore, knowing the high and the low, rich and poor, no personal feeling, no partisanship, no bitter controversial feeling will enter into my statements, but I shall speak, as I am instructed, with meekness and fear.

The question is frequently put to Protestants: Where was your religion before the Reformation had separated you and placed you outside the true church? If you are right, why is it that you are accursed by the true church? To these and similar questions we ought to be able to give an intelligent answer.

We are Protestants because, as the Reformers and those who followed them protested against the doctrines of the

Church of Rome, so do we. They did not take or choose the name themselves. It was given to them from outside. We are, for instance, Presbyterians, and so called because the officers of our church are appointed, as we read of Timothy in the Scriptures, "by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." But we are called Protestants because we refuse to bow to the authority of the Church of Rome.

Why do we protest and why are we entitled to the name of Protestants? The first reason is, the living Word of God itself.

The holy Scripture, being the Word of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. We believe with the Apostle James that we receive the engrafted word, which is able to save our souls. It is able to save, for it tells you the way in which you may be saved.

The Church of Rome did not regard the Word of God in that way. Do not take my word for this statement, but hear the decision of the Council of Trent regarding the Scriptures: "All saving truth is not contained in the Scriptures, but partly in unwritten tradition, which whoever does not receive as the Scriptures, is accursed." That is to say, human traditions are put on the same basis with the Word of God and given the same authority. We could not accept that, as we put all other authority and unwritten traditions aside.

When the Reformation triumphed, the holy Scriptures were widely distributed among the people in England, Germany, Switzerland, and with the emigrants from those countries the Bible came to the United States.

Now in all these lands where the Bible had its right place—as in the leading Protestant nations of the world—prosperity and civilization were the inevitable results, while the reverse can be demonstrated of Catholic countries. Even in

Switzerland, in those cantons where the Word of God is free we find greater prosperity than in those cantons that are under the Roman Catholic Church.

In recent years the authorities of Rome are said to recommend the reading of the Bible. But that was not so in past ages, and is not so now everywhere.

I have had in my hands the burnt remains of Testaments taken from the hands of peasants, burned by their own spiritual leaders. Deny to the Bible its place and put it on an equal basis with human traditions! We could not receive such a doctrine, and therefore protested against it.

The second reason why we are Protestants is the attitude of the Church of Rome towards Christ, an attitude that necessitates protest. The church is compared to a body, the mystical body of Christ and Christ is the Head of the Church. The Apostle Peter speaks of Christ, as the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. He has all power in heaven and on earth. He gave the promise to His people: Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

Why then should there be a vicar, a substitute, a human being, standing in His place with all power over all rulers and princes of this world, and even with personal infallibility. Christ does not need any deputy in His place. But somebody might object and say: Did not Christ tell Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church!" Does not that give Peter the supremacy? It is not so easy to make the sense of these words as clear in the English translation as it appears in the Greek. *Petros*, which means in Greek Peter, is masculine; *petra*, which means rock, is feminine. Jesus says to Peter: "Thou art *Petros*, and on this *petra* I will build My Church. What *petra* did He mean? Christ had asked: "Whom say

ye that I am?" and Peter answered: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That confession of *Petros* was the *petra* upon which Christ was to build His Church. It is, as we might say, a play of words. Suppose a man whose name is Stewart comes to me for a charitable purpose, and it so happens that I know him to be an honest, reliable person. Suppose I have employment for him which I can offer him, I can then say: Mr. Stewart, I am glad I have something for you, and I know you will be a good steward.

Christ meant that Peter saw the rock in his confession of the Divinity of Christ. That was the radical truth, the rock, on which the church should be built. The church indeed is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus being the chief corner stone. But does not Christ say immediately after, "I shall give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." That means: Peter was used by Christ to preach the Gospel, the first to open the Gospel to the Jews and Gentiles. He was Christ's apostle and had by that promise of Christ received the honor to open the door first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles.

But Christ said: Whosoever sins you forgive will be forgiven. Does not that give power to Peter to pardon sins? No! Read Jeremiah, the first chapter, where the Lord said to him: "I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." But Jeremiah never planted, never built kingdoms. It meant that God would use him to tell to the nations how He would build. In other words, He gave him declarative power, not executive power. Christ uses the same lang-



uage to His other apostles also telling men how sins may be remitted and how retained. It is on this account, that we cannot accept the idea to put a man, even the most distinguished and learned man at the head of the church, as the Papacy has done, Jesus being sole head of the Church. He alone has authority and power and He alone bought that Church with His own blood. It was He who sent the Comforter to sanctify men and to prepare the militant church for the triumphant.

The third reason why we are Protestants is, that Christ is the Mediator; that is, He is appointed to be mediator between fallen man and God.

There are not many mediators. He is the only one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus. But there are many mediators practically presented by the Church of Rome, against which the Reformers protested.

The Virgin Mary and other saints are asked to mediate. This is done without scriptural basis; nothing in the Bible gives sanction for that use. He is the one Mediator and Redeemer. But in the Church of Rome there are far more prayers presented to Mary and the saints than to God through Christ. All saving power is ascribed by the Scriptures to Christ as Mediator, but in Rome this power is shared by creatures, and thus Christ is dishonored. Look in the old Testament! What magnificent saints do we find in the Hebrew people. Why did the Jews not call on Abraham, Isaac, Jacob; on David, and Joseph; why did they not pray to Samuel the holy prophet? You never hear of such mediators. In the whole Bible there is no sanction given to such practice, to call on creatures however glorified.

The fourth reason why we protest is, that Christ came into the world and began His ministry in due time. He came to found the new dispensation of

the Christian religion. "In these last days" God spoke through His Son. He came to die for our sins and shed His blood. He finished the work that had been given Him to do; they nailed Him to the tree; He was crucified, and before dying He said: "It is finished." He had completed the work He came to do. Since He offered Himself, there is no other sacrifice needed: "By one offering He perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10: 14.

In the Church of Rome the completeness of that offering is practically denied, for it is repeated in the mass. The mass is said to be the self-same sacrifice of the Cross, an offering for the sins of the living and of the dead. This is against the teaching of the Bible. We have redemption by the blood of Christ, and it is not for any man to repeat that work which a human being cannot do, and which was only possible for Christ. In order to justify the mass the doctrine of transubstantiation had to be taught. It means that when the priest has consecrated the elements, the bread and wine are turned into the body, blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. It is a "host," that is, a sacrifice, and it has to be worshipped, because there in the bread and wine you have the Divinity of Christ. We have to protest against that. It is against the teaching of the Scriptures. There is no basis for it in the Bible.

But somebody may ask, Did not the Master say, "This is my body?" Yes, in the same sense as "this cup is the new testament of my blood." He evidently meant the wine in the cup. He also said, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." That expression is symbolical, because neither is He a tree nor are we real branches. The same figures are used even in conversational language. As you take this bread broken and this wine poured out, so you in faith take Me as your Substitute and Redeemer, and this you will do to the end of the world.

What a difference between these statements and the teachings of Rome! Besides, we could mention here, though it concerns our subject indirectly, that Only the bread is given to the laity. Paul never suggests such a distinction; on the contrary, he says all should partake of the bread and wine; and indeed the Corinthians certainly used in the Lord's supper both the bread and the wine, because we read that they abused it and that drunkenness was connected with it.

No other offering is there for removing sin than the blood of Christ.

Another cause for protesting is the method accepted by the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of justification. The Council of Trent condemns justification by faith: "If anyone says that a sinner can be justified by faith, let him be accursed."

The teaching of the Bible is, that for justification and for pardon all that is needed is faith in Christ: "What must I do to be saved?" asked one man of an apostle, and he answered "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." The Bible says: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." What a significant coincidence we can discover in the circumstance that this doctrine of justification by faith is given such prominence just in the epistle to the Romans, written there as a permanent protest against the errors of their church.

What is justification? It is the pardon of sins. God condescends to speak to men in clear language—"your sins I will remember no more." But does that not entitle a person to do whatever he pleases? No. It is written that there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus. But listen to what the apostle further has to say: "there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but

after the spirit."

This faith is a saving faith connected essentially with the change of the spirit. The man who believes is new-born and made a new creature. This is the doctrine which we learn from John: "He came unto his own and his own received him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God even to them that believe on His name; who were born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." When a sinner believes in Jesus, he is a new creature, his heart is inspired with love of Christ. His righteousness is imputed to me, He loved me and I love Him in return, and because I love Him, I will not sin any more. The love of Christ constraineth me. If I believe that I am justified by faith in Jesus, I do not believe in so many repetitions of the Lord's Supper, in so many sacraments, in the efficacy of human absolution, that my sins may be pardoned; I do not need to live in fear and expectation that I shall be consigned to purgatory for punishment of my sins. If we believe in Jesus, when the soul has departed, we are only absent from the body, to be present with the Lord, at home in His many mansions.

It was necessary therefore to protest, because these truths were not taught by the Church of Rome and still are condemned by that church. Another reason why there had to be a protest and why we still must protest is, because the Church of Rome made new and additional institutions besides those given by Christ Himself. We must protest against institutions which have not the sanction of Christ, the Head of the Church. There were two sacraments in the Jewish dispensation, two witnesses for the truth of God to man, and there were likewise two sacraments in the Christian dispensation, that is, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Baptism was ordered by Christ after

His resurrection when He said to His disciples: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," and so the Lord's Supper became a sacrament when Christ said: "This do in remembrance of Me." These two sacraments Christ instituted, and it is not our purpose now to show, that there is a close relation between these two.

In addition to these two sacraments five others had been invented by the Church of Rome. And for this reason it was necessary to protest. Not only did Jesus not institute those new sacraments but they imply statements directly contrary to the Word of God. These assertions are not my own view. I quote again the Council of the Roman Catholic Church. "I profess also that there are seven sacraments of the new law instituted by Christ. Whosoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Christ our Lord, or that any is not truly sacramental let him be accursed."

I am "accursed," for I cannot believe that they were instituted by Christ. I find that many centuries had passed before that idea of seven sacraments was accepted in the Roman Church. Not until the twelfth century was that number maintained and accepted.

This is one of the many forms of arbitrary action practised by the Roman Church in which there is an aggression on the power of Jesus; institutions of man claiming the authority of Christ, for which there is nothing in the Bible.

It was a duty on those who believed the Scriptures, to lift up their protest against such an abuse. Besides all these points which we just enumerated, we could add many more. Be it sufficient to mention in the same relation celibacy; the use of images in worship, condemned in the Bible; the worship in unknown tongues; the confessional,

and extreme unction.

But I will not dwell upon these things now. Let me only mention some of the positive scriptural facts which must appeal to our individual conscience. God is in Christ reconciling sinners to himself. When we believe in Jesus, He becomes our Prophet, our Priest and King. He is our Prophet, because He teaches us; He is our Priest, because He atones for us and is ever living to make intercession for us; He is our King because He rules us and defends us from our enemies. We are complete in Him, and all who are complete in Him, are holy.

I am not a priest any more than any one of you believers. "You are a royal priesthood," is said to all those who believe in Christ. It is your privilege to be priests of the new covenant, bringing sacrifices to God, not for sins, but sacrifices of gratitude acceptable to Christ.

However, a man may be a Protestant and hold all truths which are here indicated; but that will not save him. His heart must be given to Christ. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

Take Jesus as your one only Saviour, your High Priest, His righteousness imputed to you, and you shall be accepted to the glory of God's grace.

There is a sweet verse in the epistle to the Romans, that might be called the biography of a saved soul; "But now, being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." These are the four chapters of the biography.

"Made free from sin;" that is justification. Thus I become a servant of God; now I am His. He saved me; I am joined with Christ; I have to honor Him and to serve Him. This is consecration, a consecration unto holiness, as it is written: "Be ye holy, for



I am holy." The believer in Christ constantly tries to bring forth fruit unto holiness.

The fourth and closing chapter of the biography is: "And the end everlasting life—life in heaven, life with the angels, life with Christ, life with the departed saints; a holy life, a happy and eternal life. That is glorification. God has linked all these things together: whom He loves, He loves to the end.

In order to get this life, the sinner has to believe in Jesus, commit himself to Jesus the Saviour, and thus we have redemption through His blood.

The great mystery of salvation begins with love and pardon and is perfected in glory. "By grace ye are saved through faith."

Oh! my brethren and sisters, sickness and death will come to you. It may be you will have then sufficient clearness of mind to realize that you are going into the unseen world, and perhaps not. So get ready now, and when you are going to meet the king of terrors you will be able to say and to repeat the words which my predecessor, the Rev. Dr. Alexander, repeated in the last moments of his life: "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day." That is faith, saving, triumphant faith. Death is robbed of his sting and the grave of its victory. My spirit shall be deprived of its body, but I shall be happy for ever and ever, and the body will, in due time, be raised up and glorified.

May God make those truths real to you that you may have your affections set on the things above!

NOTE.—The report of Rev. Dr. Hall's sermon gives very fully the substance of the discourse, without, of course, reproducing always the exact words.

We shall publish this great sermon in tract form for general distribution. It will do great good to Protestants and Catholics. Fifty copies will be sent to any address for one dollar.

## Services in Masonic Temple.

Many Roman Catholics including several priests were present in Masonic Temple to hear Dr. John Hall. Mr. O'Connor said they were most welcome, as the services were intended to be especially helpful to them. He requested the congregation not to express surprise but rather pleasure at the presence of priests. Some of the latter try to conceal their identity by turning up the collars of their coats and resorting to other devices, but this was unnecessary and superfluous labor. With collars up or down the priests are easily recognized. It is only by renouncing the priesthood and acquiring the manners and morals as well as adopting the dress of good citizens that they can escape recognition and become like other men. They must put off the old man and put on the new, and this can be done only by accepting Christ as their Saviour—their Prophet, Priest and King, as Dr. Hall said.

A large number of Catholics attend the meetings who have lost faith in the Church in which they were brought up, and to them the Gospel preached at these services is specially helpful. Many of them unite with the various churches after attending the meetings for a season.

The congregations that assemble in Masonic Temple are much larger than could be accommodated in the chapel of Christ's Mission, where the prayer meetings, lectures and conferences are held, and the influence upon the community is much greater. Hence it is thought advisable to continue the meetings during the cool months of the year and return to the chapel when the congregations become smaller. Funds are needed, however, to meet the expenses of the meetings, and it is hoped those who are interested in the work will do what they can in this respect.

## MORE POLISH BIBLES NEEDED.

BY PAUL POLLACH, D.D., M.D.

THE article "No Bible in the Polish Language" published in the February CONVERTED CATHOLIC was inspired solely by an evangelical motive and contained no explicit or implicit reflection upon anybody.

The statements therein advanced were these: that there are 2,000,000 Polish people in the United States; that their number is increasing; that there is a demonstrably hopeful element for evangelical Christianity among them; that the Bible is practically unknown to them, they being Catholics with a dozen Bibles among them; and that the only edition of the complete Bible here on sale, namely, the Vienna edition, is in some respects defective.

Rev. Dr. Gilman, the Secretary of the American Bible Society, considers these statements wrong or misinformation of facts, and thinks it his duty to express this view of his to the Editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, in the following letter:

"BIBLE HOUSE, N.Y.

FEB. 26, 1896.

"REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR,

"*Dear Sir:*—I have received a copy of the CONVERTED CATHOLIC for the present month in which my attention is called to the following statements, 'that it would be impossible to find a dozen Polish Bibles among the numerous Polish families in America;' and that 'the British and Foreign Bible Society has published an edition of the Bible in the Polish language which was printed in Vienna,' some assumed defects of which are given by way of proving that among the necessities of the day is a correct translation of the Scriptures in Polish.

"It is very evident that in inserting this article, you must have been misinformed about facts. Not "a dozen Pol-

ish Bibles among Polish families in America?" But in five years past the American Bible Society has circulated in this country 566 Polish Bibles, and 5923 New Testaments, and has now published an edition of the Gospel of St. Mathew in Polish and English for the special purpose of helping these Polish families to become familiar with our excellent English Bible.

"One edition of the Polish Bible printed in Vienna? But do you not know that the British and Foreign Bible Society reported a year ago that in the course of their history they had published no less than 732,920 volumes of the Scriptures in the Polish language, of which 143,357 were complete Bibles?

"The translation faulty? But how about the new version of the New Testament prepared by a committee of Warsaw scholars and published fifteen years ago? And even if the older version following the Dantzic edition is not all that could be desired, is it worth while to suspend its circulation because it says 'perdition' and 'give tribute' in passages where some one thinks that 'destruction' and 'pay tribute' would better accord with good scholarship? Ought we not to be thankful that so much has been done, and well done, to give the Poles, at home and in this country, access to the Bible in their own language, and in a form which, with the blessing of God, is able to make them wise unto salvation?

"I am respectfully yours,

EDWARD W. GILMAN,

Cor. Sec."

Now, first of all, the expression, "a dozen Bibles," which appears so objectionable, is evidently not an arithmetical figure.

Suppose it means two dozen or even

566 Bibles distributed here by the American Bible Society? What are 566 Bibles in proportion to two million people, distributed in five years? (These are the statements that the doctor kindly furnishes in his letter.) Moreover, it is not impertinent to consider in this place that of these 566 Bibles undoubtedly a large proportion is in the hands of missionaries or Christian workers. One of those 566 is, for instance, in Mr. O'Connor's library.

The above statement regarding the absolute want and need of Polish Bibles will be confirmed, however, by a letter of the Rev. F. Kolaszewsky, an independent Catholic Polish priest in Cleveland, Ohio, who is actually contemplating the way of turning with his whole congregation to the Protestant Church. In his letter dated Feb. 6, 1896, he writes, among other things: "What you say (in your article) about the Polish Bible is true. Among our 20,000 Polish people here in Cleveland, *not one* has a Polish Bible, not one reads the holy Bible. . . . I have organized a library.

. . . Could you procure fifty or more Polish Bibles for us? But I must have them gratis, as we are very poor."

Now if those 566 Bibles are as equally distributed among the rest of the Polish people in America as among the 20,000 of whom Rev. Kolaszewsky speaks, the phrase "a dozen Bibles" was indeed a hyperbole.

In corroboration of Father Kolaszewsky's statement another Polish priest writes from Pennsylvania, where there are tens of thousands of Polish Catholics, as follows:

"It may happen, especially in our day, to hear Roman Catholic bishops and even the Pope recommend the reading of the Holy Scriptures. But we ought to remember that the Bible has always been and still is a dangerous book for the Roman Catholic Church. There can be no doubt that any exhor-

tation or encouragement for the reading of the Scriptures says one thing, and means another. Facts are more eloquent and significant than words. A most conclusive proof to my mind that the Roman Catholic Church officials are to say the least, indifferent towards the Bible, ought to be the simple fact, that I, having been a priest for 15 years myself, never saw a copy of the Bible in the Polish language. The only edition of the Bible which I used for Church purposes was printed with half the Latin text and half the Polish translation. This edition besides was written in the antiquated Polish tongue, containing a great number of obsolete words and expressions, hardly understood by the common people. I never had any order to recommend the reading of the Bible to my people, nor do I remember of having ever done so, or spoken about the Bible to my flock. There are two million Poles in these United States, and I can boldly say that it would be a hard task to find among the Catholic families a single copy of the Bible in their own language.

"I believe with my whole heart that the Word of God alone can and must regenerate the Poles here in America, and bring them from darkness and superstition into the light of Truth. The Bible should be distributed freely among them so that they could open their eyes to the beauty of the Lord, and His Word would reach them as a new revelation.

"There is indeed a noble work to be done, and the American people, by attending to this sacred duty, would undoubtedly once more fulfill the ever living command of our Divine Saviour: "Go and teach all nations."

Dr. Gilman speaks in his letter of 5,923 New Testaments, etc., published by the American Bible Society. The disputed article in the CONVERTED CATHOLIC does not deny it, but simply

speaks of "the Bible," which comprises the Old and New Testaments. There is no complete edition of the Polish Bible published in America. Dr. Gilman informs us furthermore, that the Foreign Bible Society printed in the course of their history 139,357 complete Bibles.

Granting these figures, we ask again: What are these copies, published during 100 years, in proportion to ten million souls? And, again, what about the copies that are in the hands of Protestants, in public libraries, or are still unsold, and what about those copies that have been undoubtedly destroyed in these 100 years by Catholic priests?

Besides that, Dr. Gilman denies that the translation referred to in the article, is faulty, and points to the Warsaw edition, prepared by scholars, etc.

Now our article in the CONVERTED CATHOLIC speaks only of the Vienna edition of the Bible, because this is the only edition which is on sale here.

The translation of the Bible ought to be as accurate and as conformable to the original as possible. It is simply a matter of philological competency to demonstrate *ad evidentiam* that the above mentioned Vienna edition really contains many expressions for which the proper words could be substituted.

The limited space at my disposal in this article prevents me from entering into further details. Attention could be called to the headings of the various books in the Vienna edition, which are in the Latin language of the Vulgate, or Roman Catholic edition, and in the Polish language on alternate pages. What reason is there for Latin headings in a Protestant Polish Bible?

A revised translation of the Bible in the Polish language is necessary, and the demand for it is not extravagant when Polish scholars declare the translation in the Vienna edition imperfect.

Dr. Gilman closes with the remark

that we ought to be thankful that so much has been done.

Yes, we ought *always* to be thankful to the Lord, but we hope and pray for more blessings.

The Polish people here do not understand the English language. They are all Roman Catholics, and the Bible must be carried to them; they will not come to the Bible.

But they were always a glorious race, loving liberty and struggling for freedom.

They have shown their manhood and their indomitable spirit in the fierce and persistent fight for national independence. Death and Siberia have swallowed millions of those unknown heroes, and two millions have come to these shores to seek that liberty which their country could not grant them. Here in America they have found freedom, and they begin to be conscious again that they are living on a soil which responds to their toil and is worthy of their strong affection.

But freedom from oppression and the liberty of pursuing the rights of life and of social happiness are only subordinate to the liberty of the spirit, or rather are the legitimate fruits of spiritual freedom, of that freedom which can only be obtained by truth. The truth shall make them free.

Here on this continent the Word of God will make them truly free.

The following is the title page of the Polish Bible which was purchased at the Bible House, New York, in January, for seventy-five cents.

# BIBLIJA ŚWIĘTA

TO JEST

WSZYSTKO PISMO ŚWIĘTE

STAREGO I NOWEGO

TESTAMENTU.

Z HEBRAJSKIEGO I GRECKIEGO JEZYKA  
NA POLSKI

PILNIE I WIERNIE PRZETŁOMACZONA.

WIEDEN.

NAKŁADEM BRYTANSKIEGO I ZAGRANICZNEGO  
TOWARZYSTWA BIBLIJNEGO.

1894.

## A VOICE FROM PRISON.

THE following letter was read by Pastor O'Connor at the services in Masonic Temple, Sunday evening, March 1, and caused a strong current of feeling in the congregation:

—, Feb. 26, 1896.

"REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR,

"*Dear Sir:*—For some time I have thought of writing to you, as I intend to renounce Roman Catholicism. I am a solemnly professed member of the—— Order, and as all correspondence is subject to the inspection of the Superior, I deferred writing until now. At times, while intoxicated, when an unsealed letter is presented to him he says: 'seal it yourself.' He is enjoying one such drunk to-day, so I seize the opportunity of writing to you. The incoming mail he seldom reads, so I hope and pray to hear from you. I take this precaution, for were it known I would be put in severe penance, as this is a canonically established convent with strict papal enclosure. God only knows what they would do to me. Perhaps you smile a little at this in our great republic; but alas! the world knows nothing of papal enclosure.

"Sir, I am 25 years of age, strong and healthy, and perhaps I could do some work in the world. I cannot go home to——, as all belonging to me are Roman Catholics. As I have spent 8 years in a monastery, I do not know what to turn to, and therefore I appeal to you. There are many, many doctrinal points of the Roman Church which I cannot accept. My conscience is tortured here. The inner lives of these hypocrites are revolting to me. I wish to leave and state plain facts to the world as known by me. My plan is this: Next week I will be in——. This will be the first opportunity I shall have to go out of the monastery. I officiate at a requiem high mass on that occasion. I hope to receive word from you by that time, and if you

wish, instead of returning to the monastery, I shall go to you. Please excuse the general make up of this missive, as I am in haste and feel nervous about it, not knowing what minute some one may come into my cell and notice that something is wrong. In answering please use a plain envelope, as the Superior has been connected with the——church in your city and doubtless heard of you and your work.

"Now, sir, please do something for me, and I shall never forget you. I hope I have made the case clear to you. They can say nothing but good of me here. However, it matters little what they say, even if they call me insane. I know they will be angry. They have no idea of what I intend doing, and I shall not tell them. I pray in the meantime for a favorable answer from you in the name of God. I am, your servant,——"

After reading the letter Mr. O'Connor said: "I replied to that letter in such guarded language that if the Superior, even in a sober interval, should read it, the meaning would not be clear to him, and the poor prisoner would learn that a welcome to Christ's Mission awaited him. I gave him the address of a friend in the place where he is to officiate at the high mass, and said I would esteem it an act of kindness if he would call on this friend, taking my letter with him as an introduction. I also wrote to this friend, who is a subscriber to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, asking him to befriend the runaway if he should call on him and send him on to New York. Lest a watch should be kept on the poor fellow however, and he should be unable to call on my friend, I told the latter to go to the church, and after the mass, obtain an interview with him, and rescue him if the Romans should offer any opposition. I wrote again to the convent prisoner, on February 29, in equally guarded terms, advising him to come to



New York the best way he could, and he would be heartily welcome.

"Thus stands the case. This young man is a prisoner, a good young man who has committed no crime, confined within the walls of a monastery as closely as are the prisoners in Sing Sing who are suffering the penalty of their crimes after trial by jury and sentence duly pronounced by the officers of the State. By this forcible detention within cloistered walls, where freedom and happiness are unknown, the Roman Catholic hierarchy are guilty of treason against the rights of man and violators of the Constitution of the United States. The Declaration of Independence which guarantees life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to everyone in our Republic, is a dead letter where papal enclosure is enforced, as in this case, and in hundreds of others in our country, which it is a mockery to call 'great, glorious and free' when thousands of monks and nuns are held in bondage like this young man.

"Open the convents! Open the monasteries!—those prison houses where bodies and souls of innocent men and women are confined and destroyed. How can these prisons be opened? Sixty years ago the people of New England tore down the walls of a convent and set the captive nuns free. How can the convent prisons of our day be opened? I answer, by public opinion. If that be disregarded, then let the Roman hierarchy take the consequences.

"A wave of American Patriotism is sweeping over the country carrying everything before it. The principles of the American Protective Association demand that the convents and monasteries shall be open for inspection, and that the captives in papal enclosures shall go free; and by the love of liberty that burns in the heart of every American freeman, they shall be free! God speed the day when those convents and monasteries shall be opened!"

### DR. JOHN HALL'S SERMON.

The largest audience ever assembled in Masonic Temple listened to the Rev. Dr. John Hall when he preached there Sunday evening, February 23. Every seat in the hall and platform was occupied, many remained standing until the close of the sermon and many more were unable to obtain admission. Several clergymen, the Grand Master of the Masonic Order in the State of New York, Hon. John Stewart, his Deputies and members of the Grand Lodge occupied seats on the platform. A great number of Roman Catholics were also present, among them being the well-known editor of two Roman Catholic papers, and several priests. It was a memorable service. Many of Dr. Hall's parishioners who were present said it was one of the greatest discourses they had heard, though he has been the foremost preacher in New York for twenty-eight years. The hearts of the converted Catholics and members of various churches who sympathize with the work for the evangelization of Roman Catholics that is carried on in Christ's Mission and at the meetings in Masonic Temple were filled with gratitude to God for the success of the meeting. They will never forget Dr. Hall's kindness. Fervent prayers that God might bless him went up to the throne of grace from many former Catholics who had suffered persecution, even from their own relatives, for having turned away from the Pope and his church to follow Christ and serve Him in the fellowship of Protestant Christians. After hearing that great sermon, "Bible Reasons Why We Are Protestants," and reading it in this issue of **THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC**, those good converts from Rome, who, like other intelligent Protestants, admire the work of the Reformers of the 16th century, who were also converted Romanists, can "give a reason for the hope that is in them." J. A. O'C.

## ROMAN CATHOLIC NOTES.

BY REV. A. LAMBERT, KINGSTON, JAMAICA, WEST INDIES.

A Roman Catholic priest has lately written letters to the London *Daily Chronicle*, from one of which we clip the following :

"The report that celibacy will be abolished and priests permitted to marry may be merely a fabrication woven by Protestants, but it may have been woven by Catholics, in which latter case the wish was father to the thought. If there were any evidence that a particle of truth lay under it, 50,000 priests in Europe would jump for joy. There are men we know who are naturally celibates, and when such as these are Catholics, and good religious men, they have no difficulty. But the celibacy of the clergy has always been to some extent a sham, and its profession a hypocrisy. . . . It has caused almost all the defections and apostacies that have ever taken place from among the clergy, and has deprived the church of some of her most brilliant and devoted ministers. . .

"To say that the Catholic priest renounces 'the best' of good things 'for the love of Christ' is mere fiction. Two out of every three of us, to put the matter mildly, do so in order to get a living; and it is safe to say that the majority of those who have made the renunciation have been inveigled into doing so.

"The *modus operandi* is this: A certain number of boys of ten or twelve years of age, mostly of artisan parentage, are picked up by the clergy and sent to a preparatory school, called in France a *petit seminaire*. There and afterwards at a higher school, called a *grand seminaire* they receive, if they show capacity, perseverance, and the requisite docility, a fairly liberal education, together with a religious and theological training. . . They are taught to look upon every act or word, or even momentary thought which may lead in the direction of mar-

riage as a mortal sin. So continuously is this doctrine dinned into their ears that probably ninety per cent. at the time of their ordination actually believe it, and the other ten per cent. imagine they do. They 'make a compact with their eyes,' etc.; but in two or three years there comes a rude awakening. But what can the poor men do? Their education unfits them for any other walk in life. . . .

"A priest may do many things and be forgiven; but let him honestly marry, and the church does her best to execrate him. She will not, under any circumstances, give him leave to withdraw into lay communion and marry. Stay he must, and be saved if he can; if he ceases to live as a priest, he shall not be saved if the church can help it. So a good many go in despair—more than Catholics dream of; and a good many stay in despair, and make the best of a very bad job."

## AN EASTER COLLECTION.

A good deal has been and is still said on the priests' love for "filthy lucre," and the generosity of Romanists. But there are recreants among them, it seems. At the end of an appeal made to their flock by the priests of the Mission Church, Roxbury, Boston, Mass., and in which the faithful "Irish" are exhorted to be "open-handed, open-pocketed and open-pursed," we find the following interesting item :

"Envelopes will be given out at all the masses on Sunday. There are eight thousand persons in this parish. Consequently you cannot be surprised when we say, openly and boldly and frankly—and we mean what we say, and say, too, what we mean and expect,—you cannot be surprised when we tell you, in plain words, that from those eight thousand persons we expect at least

five thousand dollars (\$5,000). Don't stop to reckon! Simply take your envelopes and bring it back on Easter Sunday, bulging and bursting with the bills of your generosity, showing that you love your priests, that you love your church, and that you love your God who deigns to dwell in your church.

"Moreover, we want no one—and mark this well—we want no one to be so mean, so base-spirited so utterly devoid of nobility of character and generosity of nature, as to put a large, ugly coat button, or a blank sheet of paper, or an insulting letter, into the envelope, and drop your envelope with its vile contents into God's treasury. We blush to mention this; but it has happened several times. Let such soulless Catholics beware! That offering is for your God and for your church. Let your offering, therefore, be worthy of your God and your Catholic Church.

"If the sorrowful life and sufferings and ignominious death of Christ on the cross is not worth more than a button, or a few pennies, then you might as well consider yourself not worthy of heaven either. Be generous! Five thousand dollars is the lowest mark!—your God and your church your motive!"

We want all Protestant Christians to think for a few moments on "the priestly clownishness" exhibited in the abominable parallel between the life, sufferings, and death of our blessed Saviour and Rome's money box.

#### WHAT CARDINAL MANNING SAID.

What was the state of the Roman Church at the time of the Protestant Reformation! Did it need reforming? We do not expect modern Romish controversialists to make many startling admissions on this head, yet what the late Cardinal Manning said on the subject may well be quoted here. Preaching before the third Provincial Council of Westminster, 1859, he said:—"The

Council of Trent was in an eminent sense the Council of Reformation. It would be an unpalatable task to dwell on the evils of the time. But an example or two may suffice. The second See of the West—the See founded by St. Barnabas, whose patron was St. Ambrose, had hardly, for eighty years, seen its Archbishop. It had been governed by Vicars, of whom many had better not have been there. There were parish priests who knew not the form of absolution in the sacrament of penance; there were priests celebrating the holy mysteries, who believed themselves exempt from the duty of confession. They dressed as laymen and wore arms. If such were the priests, what were the people?" (Manning's "Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects," Vol. I., page 154.)—Is it not still more or less so nowadays?

#### GUYING CARDINAL GIBBONS.

The N. Y. *World's* correspondent at Rome tells this story of a trick played on Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore.

"Cardinal Gibbons has been for several months the object of mystification, which threatens to create some difficulties. A Parisian journalist asked him for a letter of approbation for a book which was a refutation of Zola's *Lourdes*. Cardinal Gibbons hastened to reply with a short letter, couched in the warmest terms. The journalist published it as a preface to his book, which contained scandalous biographies of the cardinals at Rome. To those who did not know the inner working of this plot, it appeared as if Cardinal Gibbons had given his approbation to this book. The feeling produced by this incident is not yet appeased, and the cardinals attacked in the book, which is called "*Les Coulisses du Vatican*," have made several complaints to the Pope; but as the good faith in Cardinal Gibbons does not seem to be irreparably destroyed, Leo XIII. resolved to pay no

attention to the incident." For a joke, this is a joke! We would like to see the book.

#### SECRET OF PROTESTANT PROSPERITY.

We clip the following from an article in a French paper :

" I would like to see by the sides of the crucifixes in our houses, also a copy of the four Gospels. It does not, in fact, suffice to set up a picture of the crucified God-man, we must see to it that the people learn to know Him and to love Him. It has been said that Christ is incorrectly understood ; we should rather say he is not known to our people. In our days in Protestant lands the father of a family is accustomed to read the Bible to his people and to conduct family worship. Possibly this is the secret of the outward prosperity of Protestant countries. In France the Catholics are not acquainted with the life and history of Jesus Christ. The Christian women, in fact, know nothing of Him except what is written in their prayer books. This is entirely too little. We should blush as Catholics to be in this regard behind our forefathers and behind the Protestants. Why should we not return to our old traditions and make systematic efforts to spread the Gospel ! " Alas, it is not in " la belle France " only that such ignorance is found ; it exists in all countries where Rome has an undisputed sway.

#### Representatives at the Vatican.

The representatives of foreign nations accredited to the Vatican include the following countries : Austria, Hungary, Bavaria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Hayti, Monaco, Peru, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, San Domingo and Spain, the only important exceptions being United States, Great Britain and the various Asiatic powers. The Pope has diplomatic representatives at most of these places, with the exception of Berlin and St. Petersburg. At Washington and Constantinople are papal representatives, but not accredited to the Government.

#### Cardinal Manning and Converts.

Our English exchanges last month brought the good news that " Rev. Victor Hodgson, whose secession to the Roman Catholic Church was announced last year, has been received back again into the Church of England by the Rev. W. S. Duggan, Vicar of St. Paul's Church, Oxford."

Many English clergymen who became Roman Catholics and learned by experience what an unchristian and anti-christian system Romanism is, have returned to Protestantism without making any public announcement of their change of faith, though when they entered the Roman fold the news was trumpeted forth to the world. The " Life of Cardinal Manning," recently published, shows how such men are denounced by even high Roman ecclesiastics as " apostates," traitors," etc., the same as the converted priests who were born in the Roman communion and by the grace and mercy of God have been delivered from it. The spirit of Rome is the same in all countries—always and every where evil. Nothing but the power of God can exorcise that evil spirit. Manning's correspondence and diaries exhibit him as a true Roman ecclesiastic, ambitious, scheming, deceitful; pretending to be the dearest friend of Cardinal Newman, yet stabbing him in the back and secretly plotting against him and others of whom he was jealous or who stood in the way of his own advancement. He assailed Canon Ffoulkes when the latter renounced Romanism and returned to the ministry of the Anglican Church. Many gentlemen who " went over to Rome " after the example of Manning and Newman have been deterred from publicly declaring their loss of faith in Romanism through fear of annoyance and persecution. Manning himself experienced a reaction towards the end of his life. For ten years before his death he had not visited Rome.

## REASONS FOR RENOUNCING ROMANISM.

BY REV. PATRICK PAUL BOLAND, PRIEST OF THE REDEMPTORIST ORDER.  
[An Address Delivered at Blackburn, England, December 2, 1895.]

## II.

**A** GAIN, when studying the doctrine of Romish infallibility I discovered that it rests on fallible foundation, because Mormons and Romanists claim to be infallible, but no independent infallible authority has pronounced which is infallible.

Again, some Romish councils were not general councils at all. The last council that established the doctrines about the Papal infallibility and the immaculate conception could not be general, because there was not even one representative bishop of the Greek Church there. They were not, then, general councils but Papal cabals, composed of the Pope's creatures, to carry out the Pope's designs. Were these councils infallible? No! emphatically, no. Besides, councils contradict each other. For example, Constantinople was against image worship, and the Second Council of Nice was in favor of image worship. Also, the councils of Frankfort and Elleberis, were against the worship of images, and therefore, against the Second Council of Nice. Again, the Council of Ariminum was in favor of Arianism, and other councils condemned it. The Councils of Constance, Pisa and Basil held that a general council was above a pope, and the Council of Florence and the Fifth of Lateran held that a pope was above a general council, and could overrule such council. Now, in the name of God, who can decide which of these councils is right or wrong, which fallible or infallible?

I saw, too, that Romish infallibility was practically useless. Rome has never yet given an infallible sense or interpretation of even one chapter in the Bible.

I also examined the controverted question of the supposed immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and I found that the Scriptures emphatically contradict the Romish doctrine about the supposed immaculate conception. For St. Paul says (Rom. iii., 23,) "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." And again (Rom. iii., 10,) "There is none righteous, no, not one." Again, (Rom. vi., 23,) "The wages of sin is death." Now the terms all, none, no, not one, are general and admit of no exception. Then, as the wages of sin is death, and as the Blessed Virgin died, she could not be immaculate or sinless. Besides, the Blessed Virgin herself, in her own canticle the "Magnificat," says "and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour" Now if the Blessed Virgin was sinless she was saved, and required no Saviour, and could not call Christ her Saviour. But she did call Christ her Saviour, and therefore she was saved through Christ, and consequently was not sinless or immaculate. The Pope of Rome and a small number of bishops assembled in council appear to know more about the state of the Blessed Virgin's soul, than she herself, or than the Holy Bible, the inspired word of God. But no matter what Rome may say or think, we believe the Blessed Virgin herself and the inspired word of God, and we reject the Romish doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

I examined all the other controverted questions, and found the Roman Catholic doctrine to be similarly erroneous and untenable, and so I rejected all these doctrines of Rome, and severed myself from Romanism forever.

But in settling my difficulties, I must admit that there is one to whom I owe a



deep debt of gratitude, and that is Canon Hobson, the vicar of St. Nathaniel's, Liverpool. He is a true minister and servant of God, a man of prayer and piety, a man of the highest erudition and culture, a man whose heart is full of the love of God and of his neighbor. In one word, he was the instrument in the hands of God through which grace and justification, by a saving faith, have come to me. Through him I have given myself to God, and my faith teaches me that God has accepted me and justified me through the merits of the precious blood of His Son and that I am saved, through faith. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John iii. 36).

These, then, are the particular reasons why I left the Church of Rome. And now we come to the

#### FOURTH POINT—WAS IT AN EASY MATTER TO LEAVE THE CHURCH OF ROME?

No, quite the contrary. And why? Because, my dear friends, it is as natural for one born and brought up in the Church of Rome to believe every article and dogma of Romish doctrine as it is for a babe to suck its mother's breast. All his surroundings teach nothing else—Roman Catholic parents, Roman Catholic friends (as a rule), Roman Catholic teachers, Roman Catholic pastors, Roman Catholic society and associations,—from the days of childhood they are wont to drink in the system of Roman Catholic theory and practice as naturally as they drank in their mother's milk. In this way the religion of Rome becomes a kind of second nature to them, so that once entangled in the Romish system, it is not easy to disentangle one's self. It is much easier to get into the Church of Rome than to come out of it. Just like the little birds that you sometimes see fluttering about in a snow-storm looking for food and shelter. A house or its shelter is not the bird's natural element; but still any port in a

storm. It flutters about from pane to pane of the window glass, and at last finds an entrance through some small hole or aperture in one of the panes. When inside, the little bird, too often to its disappointment, finds nothing whereon to feed, and so it returns again to the window and endeavors (as long as any strength or life remains) to escape, but all in vain. It was easier to come in than to escape through the window; and so the little bird dies for want of food to sustain it. So it is, my dear friends, with the Roman Catholic religion. Many a man and woman got into it either through Roman Catholic parents, or guardians, or friends, or pastors, or through some other means. But it matters not how they got in. Once in, it was hard and often impossible to get out. And so the poor victims, though often anxious to escape, have perished in the Roman Catholic Church without having found any proper nourishment therein whereby to sustain the life of grace in the soul.

#### AN OBJECTION.

But you may object, and say, how can this apply to you, or to anyone else like you, who received a good college education, and, therefore, ought to be able to judge for yourself?

Well, this objection would naturally suggest itself to the mind of a Protestant. But then you must remember that there is freedom of judgment in the Protestant religion, but there is no freedom of that sort in the Roman Catholic religion. To illustrate what I mean, let us suppose that all the books, and lithographs, and manuscripts, in the whole world were put into a library large enough to contain all; and then, that all these books, manuscripts, etc., were classified into two, and only two different classifications. One particular class of these books, manuscripts, etc., are placed on one side of the library, and all the others on the opposite side. Those

on one side are all marked as belonging to Rome. "These are Rome's, and every Roman Catholic may read them;" but all the others are marked on the index by the Pope of Rome, and no Roman Catholic may read even one page in any of these books, manuscripts, etc. Now that is exactly what Rome does in practice with every Roman Catholic, save and except a chosen few who have good livings, and who she is quite certain will keep the secret and never betray her. She has put all non-Roman Catholic works, especially controversial works, on the index, and it is, according to Romish theology, seriously sinful and deserving of excommunication to read them and give them to others to read, or even to keep them in one's house or place. Thus even the best meaning Roman Catholics are ground down to the very dust by this sort of Romish sway and tyranny; they are, in fact, curbed by bit and bridle as though they were wild horses, and the only chance of escape is to kick through the traces. In one word, one must leave the Church of Rome, and take time to read and think, and compare notes, and judge for one's self, and trust God, before he can ever expect to get the grace to be a good, thorough, *bona-fide* Protestant Christian.

But you may think that it must be much easier for a Roman Catholic priest to leave the Church of Rome than for a layman. Ah, no! The Roman Catholic priest is even more tightly fettered than the Roman Catholic layman. 'Tis true he gets a college education and training; but, then, you must remember that during his college life there are no theologies or comments within his reach but those that are on the side of Rome. These theologies and comments are all one-sided, and he has no opportunity of looking to the other side; controversial works are strictly forbidden him to read; and even during his life as a

secular priest every work that Rome has put on the index (and Rome has put all non-Roman Catholic controversial works on the index) is most strictly forbidden him too. And a Roman Catholic priest living in religion as a monk—as I have been for the space of six years—has no opportunity at all of reading any controversial non-Roman Catholic work. In the monastery there is a library, but every book and manuscript there is exclusively Roman Catholic; and you may be surprised to hear that in the library in the monastery there is a special place, strictly kept under lock and key, in which all non-Roman Catholic works are stowed. The key of that cupboard or safe is always kept under the control of the superior of the monastery, and the name by which they designate that cupboard or safe (containing any controversial works that may happen to come into the monastery from time to time, and to which no one ever can have access) is Hell. Yes, that's the name they call it—Hell.

#### CONCLUSION.

You remember, my friends, that I took for my text these words from the Gospel of St. John i., 5, "And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." And so it is with me. The light of God, calling me to the true fold of Christ, where I have obtained grace and justification and salvation, through faith in the merits of the precious blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, shone in my soul; but the darkness did not comprehend that light. Ah, yes, I was, alas, in darkness and error and superstition, and I knew it not. But the blessed Jesus has in mercy and goodness and love taken me out of the darkness. Ah, yes, that same loving, forgiving Jesus who appealed to His heavenly Father when expiring on the cross in behalf of those who put Him to death, saying, "Father forgive them,

they know not what they do," has also appealed to His heavenly Father on my behalf, and it is the hand of God that has led me out of darkness and error, and it is through the merits of the blood of that good Jesus that I have been converted and have obtained grace and pardon and justification through a saving faith, in which I live in the hope of wearing the crown that Almighty God has prepared for me, and for all those who love Him. And should God spare me long, I hope to make reparation for my past errors and ignorance, and should it be His holy will, to do what lies in my power to win others, by my example and teaching, to the true fold of Christ's Church, where their souls are washed in the blood of the Lamb, the one High Priest and Mediator, and where, too, they may find peace and happiness and security in this life, which will be a sure guarantee of everlasting glory in the life to come. Amen.

#### More of Bishop McGovern's Letters.

SYLVAN HEIGHTS, HARRISBURG, PA.

May 29, 1894.

*Dear Father*:—Rev. ——— contemplates leaving our diocese, and I give my consent, but will not give him his *Exeat* till he settles his accounts. I told him nearly a month ago to adjust these matters with the vicar general but he neglected my orders, and then sent me fragments of accounts so informal that I cannot accept them. I ask you as a favor to settle with his committee and report to me. I will not give him his *Exeat* till this is done.

Yours in Christ,

† THOMAS MCGOVERN,  
Bishop of Harrisburg.

SYLVAN HEIGHTS, HARRISBURG, PA.

June 14, 1894.

*Dear Father*:—Please accept my sincere thanks for your kind services in settling the accounts of Rev. ———.

But I must still ask the continuance of your efforts in this matter. The accounts of the committee sent to me I cannot accept for the following reasons:

First, the report of the committee does not mark the time covered by the statement. The Rev. ——— did not render to me, as ordered, his "annual report" for his missions, covering the various questions asked for the year 1893, and this report now before me is like Melchizedech—"sine patre, sine matre, sine genealogia, neque initium dierum neque finem vite habens." ["Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life."]

Second, the report of——— is signed only by one member of the committee, and if it refers to the books of the treasurer, I am surprised to find that the treasurer's name is not signed to the report.

Third, Rev.——— charges for salary in ———, \$1,268.51, and in ———' \$926.20; total, 2,194.71, while the statutes of the diocese (see page 66, par. 72,) allows him only \$1,000.00. Therefore he must refund for the benefit of his missions \$1,194.71. This money he must place in the bank, payable to my order and send me a bank certificate that \$1,194.71 is deposited in my name and to my order. Then I will send him his *Exeat*. Your effort to assist me in this case will be truly appreciated by your servant in Christ.

† THOMAS MCGOVERN,

Bishop of Harrisburg.

[We omit the name of the priest referred to in these letters, for if it were published Bishop McGovern would surely suspend him. The refusal of McGovern to give an *Exeat* or dismissorial letter to the priest unless money was paid for it, is an offence against all law, civil and ecclesiastical, for which the simoniacal bishop could be indicted and punished. But perhaps it is the priest who has been suspended and punished.]

## THE ANSWER OF MODERN LIBERALISM TO THE CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY REV. BROOKE HERFORD, D. D.

[“The third lecture to be for the detecting and convicting and exposing the idolatry of the Romish Church, its tyranny, usurpations, damnable heresies, fatal errors, abominable superstitions and other crying wickedness in their high places; and, finally, that the Church of Rome is that mystical Babylon, that man of sin, that apostate church, spoken of in the New Testament.”—Extract from the will of Judge Paul Dudley, 1750.]

### III. *Conclusion.*

OUR pious fraud”—these are not my words, remember, but his own, publicly printed in the official missionary record—“our pious fraud is greatly facilitated by the custom generally adopted by the Chinese doctors, of bathing the children’s foreheads to cool the heat which appears to rise to their heads. Wherever we find children thus in danger of death, our first care is to call for fresh water. ‘This child will die,’ we exclaim, ‘fetch some water to cool the heat that is burning in his head!’ The poor afflicted mother thinks she has discovered the saviour of her child, and hastens to furnish a cup of the desired element. On seeing the water poured upon the forehead of her suffering child she feels herself comforted by the hope of its recovery. A conversation then ensues as to the age of her son, the commencement of his illness and its effects, and in the meantime we endeavor to extinguish the fire of hell.”

Further on he adds: “My town baptiser is well adapted for the office. He makes use of a sponge to effect his purpose, and as this is a thing almost unknown to the country the Chinese imagine it contains an excellent antidote to the fever.” Father Goutelle goes on to speak with—on his own view—pardonable pride of the success of this “pious fraud.” “The mandarin and the principal persons of the town also

apply to us in case of need.” “The whole town is delighted with this good work.” “These pagans hold my pharmacy in such esteem that they have designated it Gay-jen-tang,” the place of philanthropy. By this appellation it is known even to a distance of thirty miles, and the net religious result is thus given in his own words: “In this institution alone nearly a thousand children are annually regenerated. In the absence of any means of ascertaining the number of those who die after baptism, we consider that we may safely take them at one half. Thus five hundred little angels are annually sent to heaven to sing the praises of the Lord and to act as patrons to all who participate in this good work.” And so the whole report winds up with an appeal for more funds to found similar establishments in many other places.

### ROMANISTS LESS CONSCIENTIOUS THAN GREEKS.

If the doctrine of baptism held by the church really affords sanction for such practices, and really teaches that infants thus fraudulently baptised just before death have a better standing before Almighty God than if they had died as they were, then this only gives added weight to the answer of modern liberalism that we repudiate the claim of this church to the overlordship of men’s souls. Indeed, in this respect Rome has degenerated from the more ancient doctrine still maintained in the Greek Church. For that church still regards such secret baptism of infants, without any idea that they are to be brought up as Christians, as a blasphemous desecration of the sacrament. But, apart from all theology, I cannot help feeling how the narration of this little scheme—without a word of apolo-

gy or regret for the deceit involved, but only a sort of jaunty chuckle of satisfaction—and all printed among the official reports of Catholic missions—indicates a curious difference on the matter of respect for truth to what prevails not only in Protestant bodies, but even among non-religious people of decent average honesty.

Nor is it only in dealings with pagans that one finds this difference in the canons of conduct. All along my ministry I have kept coming upon incidents illustrative of the same thing. Here it met me in the bitter sorrow of a young widow, one of my own parishioners in England, who had been married to a Catholic with the express and open stipulation that, of any children of the marriage, the boys should be brought up Catholics and the girls Protestants. But the man died leaving only one little daughter, and then it was found that in a new will, made during the death-bed visitations of his confessor, he had disregarded that stipulation, and directed his daughter to be brought up a Catholic. Nothing could be proved that legally amounted to undue influence, so the will had to stand, and the poor lady, left with her one little daughter just when the girl's mind was opening into life's deeper sympathies, had to be separated from her in that deepest part of life.

Here again it met me in a large city hospital, of which I was one of the board of management. It was managed in a broad, entirely unsectarian fashion. Ministers of all denominations were welcome to visit any of their own persuasion; and though the regular chaplain was of the English established church, he was a straightforward, manly young fellow, who never attempted to use his position for any proselyting. Among those to whom he ministered was a poor boy of twelve or thirteen, who was in a long, lingering illness, to

whom he had shown much kindness, and who had grown quite fond of him. This boy occupied a bed in a small passage ward between two larger ones. One day the nurse in charge told the chaplain that the Catholic priest had left word for him that he must not visit the boy any more, as he was a Catholic. The matter coming in that curt fashion made some little stir, and I was placed upon the committee that was appointed to inquire into the circumstances. It turned out to be that the priest, in passing through this ward, in the nurse's absence, had taken the opportunity to talk with the boy, impressing upon him that only Catholics could be saved, and the poor, frightened lad consenting, thinking, as he said, that it couldn't do him any harm, the priest had there and then taken a little bottle of holy water out of his pocket and baptised him. I suppose, on the Catholic theory of salvation, this might be defended; but our board of managers regarded it as what the world calls very sharp practice.

#### CATHOLIC ARTIFICE REGARDING MARRIAGE.

Only one other more illustration of this way in which the claim of the Catholic Church is allowed to override the common sense of truth and honor. One day, long ago now, there came to me two of my neighbors, in whom I was warmly interested by reason of their intelligence and their thrift, in as sore distress as parents can know. They told me that a daughter, a bright young woman of some 18 years, had been courted by a young fellow in the neighborhood, and had been seduced by him. The young man was a Catholic, and now refused to marry her. I advised them to apply to his priest. They did so; and their only answer was, "Let your daughter be baptised as a Catholic and the man shall marry her to-morrow." They pleaded, that she was not a Catholic. She was a Unitarian, as they



were. Of course, they allowed that in marrying him she would be free to change if she desired; and they would have even consented that any children should be brought up Catholics. But to insist upon her being baptised at once! Surely he could not insist on that as a condition of getting the man to keep his promise and do his duty. But it was all of no use.

It may have been their sensitiveness which described his manner toward them in their scrowful pleading as hard and contemptuous; but, however given, the answer remained the same; and it was repeated after reference to a higher authority: "Let her be baptised, and the man shall marry her to-morrow." If not, he would have nothing to do with the matter. They came back to me in this perplexity, and though I could not advise them under any circumstances to take a step so wrong, I hardly dared to urge them strongly against it, so sad and life long appeared the consequences of refusal. Nor did I need to urge them. The next time I saw them, just as the whole family were emigrating, when I asked whether they had finally yielded, I shall never forget the mother's answer: "No, we could not do it. I said to my husband, 'There has been sin enough already. Don't let us have any more.'"

I venture to say that in no other church in christendom would such a case have been so dealt with—in a way at once so outraging natural human feeling and so dishonoring a sacred religious service.

#### DISTRUST OF PRIESTS BY THEIR PARISHIONERS.

Perhaps it may seem hard measure to argue against an institution from such acts of individuals. There is no church but has among its clergy some less worthy than others; some perhaps, against whom things as tricky or as unfeeling might be told. But these things

I have quoted, out of my own personal knowledge, have been official acts; and I know too well from others, whose experience has been like my own, that they are no extreme exceptions. They are not illustrations of what unworthy men may do in the name of the claims of Rome, but of what those claims lead to even in average men, in lowering the standard of natural truth and right.

Indeed, I think it all comes back to this, that in Catholicism, the institution, exaggerated by these tremendous claims, has come to be so much more than the soul or spirit of it. I think, indeed, that this is felt by many of its own adherents. Even those who are entirely loyal to it constantly excuse as necessary for the church actions and requirements which in themselves they cannot defend. I am not the only Protestant who has had considerable money intrusted to him by poor Catholics. The first time I wanted to decline such a trust. "Why don't you place it with your own priest? He is a very good man, isn't he?"

"Oh, yes," was the eager reply. "He is a very good man, but still I would rather you took care of it for me. You see, if anything happened to me while I am gone, I know you would give it to my people all right."

"Well, wouldn't Father——do the same?" I asked.

"Well, I don't know;" and, after a pause, "Maybe he'd be wanting it for the church."

The same kind of feeling is constantly coming out with regard to the public schools. You seldom hear any of the Catholic parents speak against the parochial schools—the "sisters' schools," as they call them. When they speak of them at all it is usually as institutions which "of course, are quite right; of course, the church ought to have them," etc.; but all the same, every one who has much to do with the Catholic poor

in American cities knows perfectly well that they greatly prefer to have their children go to the public schools. They do not want them brought up apart. Before all things, they want them to grow up American citizens. When a Catholic school is opened in a dense district, at first numbers of the Catholic children are withdrawn from the public school and swept into the sisters' school. But after a while, you as constantly hear that many of the children are one by one, some on one excuse, some on another, finding their way back to the old institution—the school of the people. Only by the strongest appeals through pulpit and confessional, and by threats of withholding the sacraments, are specially Catholic schools kept up in any strength.

#### ROME'S POWER VIRTUALLY DESPOTIC.

And so it is in many things. The institution overrides freedom, overrides the parent. At times it comes out with the most eloquent pleas for freedom; but they are always qualified by that claim of the church to obedience in every matter which comes within the range of its authority—a range of which itself is the soul judge. So it has at times put forward the most plain-spoken and unmistakable claims for parental rights in choosing the education of their children. "By the laws of nature," says Cardinal Manning, "fathers and mothers have the guardianship of their own children;" and, again, "parents have the right to control the education of their children." But when this comes to be interpreted, it turns out to be simply a plea not for parents to obey their own judgment, but to obey their priests; and I have no need to remind you in Cambridge how rigid and absolute the obedience required, and by what terrors of religious outlawry it is, when necessary, enforced.

Thus, while there is so much that is lovely and admirable in Catholicism—

in its venerable services, in its frequent heroism in dark ages, in the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice which it wins from its votaries, yet the whole free life of man is over-weighted and dominated by the organization to an extent unknown by any other church in Christendom. This is the conviction not of the enemies of Catholicism, but even of those who are most friendly, and most desire to see the Catholic Church take its true place among the helpful institutions of the world. There have been few men more appreciative of all religious institutions, more fair and kindly in criticising them, than James Freeman Clarke, and this is his testimony: "All the evils of the Roman Catholic Church have come from this source—the organization of the church being set above the religion of the church. It has made conformity to its ceremonies, submission to its authority, the essential thing. Hence its persecutions, its inquisition, its resisting truth, its arrogant claims, its desire for wealth, its lust of power, its insatiate ambition." And Edward Everett Hale, writing of the Roman hierarchy, says: "They have never made the world believe that they regard truth first, second and last. They have made the world believe that they regard the Church as first, second and last."

There is indeed no such peril in all this now as that which was the head of all Protestant countries during the 16th and 17th centuries, and against which Judge Dudley would have as solemn and permanent warning, lifted up before his countrymen. I was struck the other day by the remark of a well known Catholic ecclesiastic who has lately felt obliged by his scientific studies, to give up the infallibility of the Church, and to withdraw from its service, and to whom I showed the title of this lecture. His only comment was that the danger to day was not of the church being a

great Babylon, but a Tammany. And that is the direction of the danger. It is always a mischief, when, in a great self-governing country, whose very *raison d'être* is its large individual freedom, any considerable portion of the people are withdrawn from the natural sympathies and free mental play of the community into a close-bound corporation claiming a separate and imperative allegiance of its own.

In any great crisis of liberty such a claim would probably snap like a reed before the larger love of country, as it did among English Catholics at the Spanish Armada. Such crises seldom happen. But still in our calmer times there are a hundred problems that keep rising up, in which the free, intelligent thought of every citizen is needed for the national welfare. And it is a mischief not to be lightly thought of when some foreign and extraneous authority claims the word, the vote, the action of a whole great party of the citizens, and this based on a still larger and vaster claim—still silently maintained everywhere, and enforced where the church has power—of a divine and absolute authority over all souls. Here is the danger, the mischief, which the Roman Catholic Church is to-day as really, though not as obtrusively, as two centuries ago. And all the more because it cannot now be met by any policy of repression or exclusion—we do not want it met in such ways; we utterly repudiate them—all the more does it need meeting, by the searching examination of its special claims, and the earnest, but clear, pointing out of their results in action and policy.

Do I say all this in any spirit of hostility? Not for a moment. There is need, in this confused, doubting and struggling modern life for all the forms and ways in which the great spirit of Christianity has embodied itself among men. If any one would see how great

—to the simple student of history and of man—may seem the work that the Catholic Church has done, and might still do, let him read the essay of James Darmesteter, the Jew, on the religions of the future, and the possible destiny of the Catholic Church, if this "admirable instrument of unity and propaganda," as he calls it, could rise to its true height. "If the church misses its opportunity," he says in closing, "if, in the name of an immutability which is simply a fiction of dogma, contradicted by its history from the very beginning, it opposes the summons of the future with a non possumus, the necessary work will be done otherwise and with greater difficulty."

It is in that spirit that the best modern liberalism owns the possibilities of the Catholic Church as a venerable and marvellous human institution. But the same liberalism just as earnestly and emphatically rejects its fatal claim of being the one only divine institution, the infallible representative of God. It is a claim which has all along been fatal to the highest spirit of truth, and the fancied authority of which has encouraged tyranny and spiritual oppression. Whether the needed reform is possible, who can tell? But meanwhile not its enemies, but its best well-wishers, are those who would try to clear it from such exceptional and tremendous claims, and to set it free, in wholesome human freedom and in frank and manly truth, to do its part in the further religious development of man.

#### Converted Priests at Christ's Mission.

If the "runaway monk" escapes safely, he will be received into Christ's Mission this month. Dr. Paul Pollach delivers learned discourses at the meetings in Masonic Temple and at the conferences in the Mission, and Dr. Vanoli has become a full-fledged professor of languages, and is busy with his pupils.

## SOME ERRORS OF ROMANISTS REGARDING PROTESTANTISM.

BY PAUL POLLACH, D.D., M.D.

I read in the New York *Independent* of February 6, 1896, the following editorial note :

"In a discussion of the question whether a Catholic may take part in a Protestant service as a hired singer in a choir, the *American Ecclesiastical Review* makes the following statement :

" 'Americans go to church more often to hear a lecture than to hear a sermon, and beyond the lecture there is little exterior worship. People meet often as they meet in a hall or at a reception, exchanging courtesies, hearing Dr. So-and-so speak on the moral aspect of Democratic or Republican majorities, etc.

" 'The singing is choice bits from oratorios, or the better class of operas, or gems of one kind or another, which it may be said without irreverence suit equally well for love-making as for declaring one's attachment to God.'

"The above statement is slanderously false. So far from occurring more often, such entertainments as are above described are extremely rare, and chiefly in services which cannot be called Christian at all."

No doubt the editor is perfectly justified in denouncing the satirical statement in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, slanderously false. Indeed, that statement seems nothing less than a malicious charge against Protestant worship, brutally comparing it to profane entertainments.

But the expression "slanderously false," might perhaps be modified if we reflect that in all probability the writer of that article in the *Review*, as a good Catholic, never was present at a Protestant service. At any rate, his opinion will appear somewhat excusable, if we remember that the errors of Catholics

about Protestantism are many, and sometimes approach insanity; but that the happy owners of these errors are in good faith.

The vast majority of our Roman Catholic brethren are entirely ignorant of Protestantism. Not only in Roman Catholic countries, but also in Protestant countries they have either a confused or an erroneous conception regarding the origin, nature and organization of the Protestant religion and the various Protestant denominations. In the eyes of Catholics the spiritual condition and estimate of Protestantism is wrapped up in the magical word, heretic, a word which in their minds is synonymous with Protestant, or a person teaching errors of a malignant character, and, according to the common use of the people, means "friend of the devil." Though I had read extensively and was well acquainted with modern Protestant literature and thought, I persevered, myself, perhaps unconsciously, in a strange attitude towards many points regarding the Protestant faith. I shall here mention some of these delusions, for it would be rather too long to enumerate them all.

One of my prominent errors was regarding the origin of Protestantism. I knew the history of the tremendous religious perversion and the subversive causes preceding the great revolution of the old church in the 16th century. But I thought, or rather I imagined I ought to think, that the principal authors of all the trouble were a few licentious men such as Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII. Now, I am not the only one who cherished such a smooth explanatory idea of the grandest historic event that the world saw in the last twenty centuries.

The same view is still universally current and accepted by all Roman Catholics. Some one, perhaps, will find it difficult to understand how a conscientious and honest mind can be reconciled with such a wilful perversion of truth. But remember that the laws of nature are always the same, that a person may by his own will and under certain circumstances induce in himself the phenomena of hypnotism, and what is self-deception but an auto-hypnotic state?

Obviously the Catholic people at large cannot be supposed or expected to know better if their teachers themselves mistake a square for a triangle and purposefully instil such doctrines even in the youthful minds of their pupils. In the catechism of Roman Catholic doctrine, No. 3, (endorsed by Cardinal Gibbons) on page 114 are found the following questions:

"When did many bad Catholics fall away from the Catholic faith?"

"In the sixteenth century many bad Catholics in Germany, France, England and Scotland fell away from the Catholic faith."

"Who caused so many bad Catholics to fall away from the Catholic faith?"

"Those who caused many bad Catholics to fall away from the faith are: 1. Martin Luther, a bad Catholic priest in Germany, who was founder of the German Lutherans. 2. Henry VIII., a wicked Catholic King of England; he was the founder of the Episcopalians. 3. John Calvin, a wicked Catholic in France; he was founder of the Calvinists. 4. John Knox, a bad Catholic priest in Scotland, founder of the Presbyterians or Puritans."

This is the Roman Catholic version of Protestant genealogy.

Another strange error that I entertained, and which is likewise spread abroad among Roman Catholics was this, that Protestants are so uncertain and fluctuating in their belief that not

two persons believe the same articles of faith, and that in all probability they themselves do not know what they believe.

Naturally, I was delighted to compare this Babylonian confusion with the supposed dogmatical unity of the Catholic Church. Such a fanciful criticism is seriously maintained by the people because the instruction in spiritual or religious matters which they receive and assimilate is generally in such terms as outlined. Again, in the same catechism, on page 115, we read:

"What do Protestants believe?"

"Protestants believe whatever they choose to believe, and therefore we see so many kinds of Protestants."

But my opinion of the Protestant faith was even less lenient than that. I had come in contact with some earnest Protestant Christians before, but I could not account for the cause of their pious lives. I thought that outside the guiding light of the Catholic Church there could be no holiness, and hence, when I had real cause for admiring them, I took it for an accidental sporadic case. I regarded the Protestant people either as atheists or rationalists, moving fast, according to the law of disintegration, towards infidelity. Here, again, I am not alone. A similar view is entertained by the writer of the above mentioned article in the *Review*.

Two weeks ago, a Catholic priest, a learned and cultured gentleman, paid a visit to one of his friends who has abandoned the Roman priesthood and has been a daily guest in Rev. Mr. O'Connor's mission, where several former priests are actually residing. In the course of conversation, this priest asked his friend whether Father O'Connor and his company believed in God and said prayers, or whether they were atheists and freethinkers. This view and suggestion is over and over repeated by the most prominent writers in the



Roman Catholic Church, and pains are taken to insinuate and inculcate it in the minds of the faithful. Let me quote from the standard work of Father Hecker, "The Church and the Age" (New York, John Farrell, 1887), in which (p. 210,) he says: "The alternative now staring intelligent Protestants in the face, is this: either they must enter into the fold of the Catholic Church to remain Christians, or become agnostics, which is a mild word for atheists."

In the same sense, I used to look on Protestantism as doomed to perish, and judging that the atrophy on one side must produce a hypertrophy or compensation on the other side, I naturally reserved the victory for the Catholic Church. But again, do not think I was isolated in this prophetic mania or pious desire. Instead of listening to my experience, hear the new apocalypse of Father A. F. Hewitt in a learned article: "The Coming Kingdom of Christ," published in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1894. On page 237, I read: "There is no need to waste time in proving that Protestantism is surely and rapidly declining, and is already in a moribund condition. This is loudly proclaimed; sometimes with lamentations, at other times with exultation by Protestants and by unbelievers. As the sects break up and founder, their numbers must either be re-absorbed into the Catholic Church, or be swept into infidelity. . . . There are intelligent non-Catholics who openly proclaim their conviction that the Catholic religion will become dominant in the United States."

Evidently Father Hewitt agrees with Father Hecker whom we quoted above.

One of my greatest errors however, about Protestantism was this: that Protestantism carried the stigma of its own condemnation on the forehead in the constantly growing division of sects.

I used to point to it as the strongest

positive argument against the Reformation. This opinion is universal among Catholics. But why this exultation and premature hallelujah? Because I could not see the pompous ritualistic unity in ceremonies and church polity, I concluded from these lame premises that Protestantism was a failure, lacking the most essential Christian characteristic, namely, unity. I forgot that with material differences there can be the most perfect unity of the spirit, which is the real unity intended by Christ. I forgot, or rather, I would not see, as so many still do at present, that the doctrinal disagreement of Protestants is almost insignificant, and perhaps less essential than the dogmatical changes which the Catholic Church has undergone in the last three centuries. I saw the sectarian division in rites and church-rules, but I did not see that there is a constant growing mutual charity and sympathy between the sects, and ignored entirely the great evangelical conventions composed of all Protestants. But people in Rome suffer from chronic day blindness. Just as they were unable to recognize what Luther's movement meant in the 16th century, so they do not see now the conscious tendency of all denominations to draw nearer in the unity of the spirit; and they do not see that Protestantism will become a mighty unit, as a living organism which, although composed of heterogeneous elements, is guided by the vital force, the one spirit. It is a cosmical and historical truth that great transformations in the evolution of individuals and nations appear gradually, and gradually reach the climax; and woe to him who cannot read the signs of the times: he will be surely whirled in the merciless vortex of his own delusion! It will do good to hear what Father Hecker, to whom we have already appealed, thinks about Protestant sects and unity. He expresses in eloquent language the universal sentiment

of the church. On page 243 of his work, "The Church and the Age," he says: "Whatever unspent force the Protestant movement may still possess, it moves in the direction of breeding new sects and forming new churches; thus Christ, who prayed for unity, is made, upon the Protestant principle, the author of division and the promoter of wrangling sects." This is the teaching Catholics receive, and therefore Protestants should not be surprised at their ignorance. Rome has always branded Protestantism as a damnable heresy, and if the letter of the anathema against heretics should be obeyed, a Catholic ought not to communicate with a Protestant even in temporal affairs, but rather persecute and oppose him. No wonder if Protestants, as far as spiritual life is concerned, are not better known even by otherwise intelligent Catholics.

Father Hecker, narcotized by the fumes of his own fanaticism vaticinates from the tripod of his Roman oracle, "America shall soon slumber in the bosom of the Catholic Church." Does he believe his prophecy will be fulfilled? Then, he must have either cast a furtive glance into the secret boudoir of the Paræ, the Sisters three, or must have had in mind the Presidential elections! But strange combination of terms: Church and Presidential elections. What has the Kingdom of Christ to do with the political agitations of this world! However, good Catholic laymen are expected to join in this ambiguously divine hope of the apotheosis of the Catholic Church. These few points, which are mere outlines, are sufficient to give at least an impulse to further psychological investigations in this direction and stimulate us to do our part in reflecting the splendor of truth and clearing up these errors; and let us also wait patiently, because it is said: *Per aspera ad astra*—through darkness to light, and light will surely triumph.

### Bishops and Church Property.

The Salvation Army property in this country is held in the name of Ballington Booth, who, until his dismissal by his father, General Booth, last month, had been Commander of the Army in the United States. He could sell, mortgage or dispose of it as he pleased. His ownership is as complete and his title to the property as perfect as that of the Roman Catholic bishops, who are the sole owners of all the church property of their denomination. In three-fourths of the Roman Catholic dioceses in this country, each bishop is a corporation sole who can buy, mortgage, or sell at his own pleasure churches, schools, asylums and all other property used for religious purposes. Even the Roman Catholic cemeteries are held by the bishop in his own name, and he can use them as he pleases. In a few dioceses, as in New York, there are trustees for the churches—the bishop himself, his vicar-general, the parish priest and two laymen. But as he can suspend or remove any of them he is master of the situation and practically controls the property in the same manner as the bishop who holds it all in his own name.

And as the Pope can remove the bishops for any cause, or no cause, it can thus be seen that he is practically the owner of all the property of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. The bishops have no power except what he delegates to them, and the withdrawal of their faculties leaves them as poor as the humblest curate. When the Pope says "Go away!" they must go. While they are obedient to him they can lord it over the priests and people in temporal and spiritual affairs. But when he is displeased with them they have neither temporal nor spiritual power. Great is the Pope! He bosses the bishops, the bishops boss the priests, the priests boss the people, and the people—oh, they can go to purgatory!

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

BY GEO. C. NEEDHAM.

## V.

THE subject of priesthood is so intimately connected with the whole scheme of salvation that it constitutes its very warp and woof. It is the substance of all Gospel doctrine, the sum of its symbolism, and the foundation of all Christian faith and hope. It brings the person of the Son of God directly before us for our study; a study from which the devout believer will not be readily turned aside. Every blessing which comes to us from a loving Father's hand is through Him who glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but was called of God to the office, as was Aaron. Heb. v. 4.

That another must mediate with God on our behalf is the innate conviction of the human heart. The sinner universally recognizes that he cannot come to God of himself, and treat directly with Him. He has no assurance of fitness in himself. Hence, in the numerous religions of all ages we find the priesthood the most essential feature. The only refuge for the soul trembling under the knowledge of God's wrath against sin is in mediation. And it is significant, though there is no evidence that this idea of priesthood reached certain nations through Scripture or tradition, that their crude worship centres in the priest. The very necessity of their fallen nature adopted a scheme which in its higher sphere is of divine origin.

In nearly all systems of religious worship priesthood in some form constitutes an essential element. Even pagan nations, recognizing the facts of holiness and sin, notwithstanding their shocking practices, seek refuge in sacrifice. The great underlying principle of one for others is the only hope of salvation. The correct application of this principle is the essence of the Gospel.

That this plan of God for our salvation through the priesthood of Christ has been grossly perverted, we need only revert to the groves of Baal, the inhuman rights of Moloch, and the frenzied votaries of Juggernaut. Besides, so-called Christian systems have leavened the truth with their corruptions, and their priesthood is but a base imitation of the divine model.

In this respect Rome has shamefully excelled. The iniquities of her confessional; her assumptions and pretensions; her mimicry of Judaistic ceremony and sacrifice, only prove what christless deeds are done in Christ's holy name. Other churches have copied Rome in thus subverting the truth. Instead of pointing to Christ they point to their human priests; in place of the great sacrifice of Calvary, they present unbloody and repeated sacrifices. With them it is no longer justification by faith, but justification through the sensuous display and unmeaning symbol of a childish ritualism. What mockery in such mummeries to an awakened conscience seeking relief from the guilt of sin, or to the helpless sinner struggling against its power!

Likewise rationalistic teachers, who glory in their creedless non-belief, with irreverent conceit assume the role of priests. "Priests of science," forsooth, they claim to be. Their immodesty is as consistent as their ignorance, the very appellation appropriated by them being a contradiction in itself. The import of the title "priest" is that of sacrificer. The essential idea is mediation. The office involves a service to be rendered to God, and a sacrifice to be presented, from which certain results must flow to the parties for whom this ministry is fulfilled. "For every high priest, being taken from among men is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins."

### CHRIST'S MISSION DEBT.

CHRIST'S MISSION is a home where Roman Catholic priests can find a refuge from the pitiless blast of furious indignation, anger, resentment and scorn that whirls around them when they leave the Roman Catholic Church. It is not a home for dissipated or immoral priests who chafe under the discipline of their church and wallow in the filth of human nature. There are many such priests in the Roman Catholic Church, and they remain in it until they die. But there is another class of priests, spiritually minded men whose consciences revolt against the false teachings and superstitious practices of their Church, and they know not the way to escape from their uncongenial surroundings. As Dr. John Hall has said, "Such men are in a pitiable condition." It is for such men that a Home has been established in Christ's Mission, where they can learn the Christian way of life as taught in God's Word and be prepared for useful careers. It has been the privilege of the pastor of Christ's Mission to welcome forty-two such priests out of the Roman Catholic Church and help them to a better life. The Mission is a door that leads from Romanism to Protestantism, and every priest who comes to it can pass through that door with the certainty that a cheerful welcome awaits him. The churches are open to him, and the fellowship of Christian friends becomes his portion. Best of all, the Saviour of men fulfills His promise, "I will give rest to your soul."

It is a privilege and a pleasure to welcome priests to Christ's Mission, but there are attendant cares and responsibilities of which those outside the Mission circle know nothing. The difficulties of a work of this kind can be understood by those who have had experience with Roman Catholics, and those who have been happily free from such

intercourse can imagine what they are. But there is one obstacle to the progress of the work which all who are interested can help to remove. That is the debt on the Mission building.

At the close of Dr. Hall's sermon in Masonic Temple last month, a collection of \$100 was taken up for the expenses of the meetings, and Pastor O'Connor was able to announce that he could raise \$500 towards the debt on the Mission building if a united effort would be made to pay off the whole debt this year. The amount of the debt is \$10,000—a mortgage on the building that must be paid. At the meeting in the Temple all agreed that the debt ought to be paid and relief thus afforded to Pastor O'Connor, who has burdens enough to carry in attending to all the details of the work, and who has no salary or provision even for his personal expenses. If this debt be paid this year, better work can be done in the Mission. It ought to be paid, every sympathizing friend will say. But saying and doing are two things. The one thing needed just now is to pay it, and this can be done if every friend of the Mission will do something. Here is a plan which, it is hoped, will commend itself to the prayerful consideration of all who wish success to this work :

100	Subscriptions of \$50	= \$5,000
100	"	" \$20 = \$2,000
100	"	" \$10 = \$1,000
200	"	" \$ 5 = \$1,000
500	"	" \$ 2 = \$1,000

Total, \$10,000

This plan distributes the debt among one thousand persons, not a large number when the importance of the work is considered. Contributions can be sent to the Board of Trustees, who are members of various churches; to the treasurer, Mrs. William Campbell, 18 West Seventieth street, New York, or to the Secretary and Pastor, James A. O'Connor, 142 West 21st street, New York.

